Appendix C. Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than \$25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1992 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures. These estimation procedures accounted for nonresponse to the data collection and for the sample data collection. These procedures are necessary because some farm operators never respond to

the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and the estimates for the sample data are based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited "rare" commodities were designated as "ineligible" to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided

in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992

Item	Percent of total
Farmspumber.	10.6
Land in farmsacres.	.9
Estimated market value of land and	
buildings ¹ \$1,000	2.0
Market value of agricultural products sold _\$1,000	1.8
Harvested croplandacres	3.2
Corn for grain or seedacres	2.6
Wheat for grainacres	1.8
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber	2.3
Hogs and pigsnumber	4.1
Hens and pullets of laying agenumber	30.8

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimates the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. The estimates were obtained from a ratio estimation procedure that resulted in the assignment of a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records in the county.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm would be multiplied by 6. The weight assigned to a sample certainty farm was 1.

Other than certainty farms, within a county, the ratio estimation procedure for farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1992 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. Both the second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were as follows:

TVP	SIC	Acres
\$1 to \$999 \$1,000 to \$2,499 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$9,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000 or more	01 All crops 02 All livestock	1 to 69 70 or more

The first step in the estimation procedure was to classify the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial post strata formed by the three sets of groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample weight equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This weight was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure was to combine, if necessary, the 32 initial post strata to increase the reliability of the ratio estimation procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms after nonresponse adjustment or had a weight greater than two times the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2 or 6, depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2 or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the initial 32 post strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each of the final post strata and were used to calculate final sample weights.

The final step consisted of assigning the noninteger final post stratum weight to the sample farm records in each post stratum. The weight is the ratio of total farm count to sample farm count in each final post stratum. The noninteger sample weight, the product of the noninteger final post stratum weight and the nonresponse weight, was randomly rounded to an integer weight for tabulation. If, for example, the final weight for the farms in a particular post stratum was 7.2, then 0.2 or one-fifth of the sample farms in this post stratum were randomly assigned a weight of 8 and the remaining four-fifths received a weight of 7.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

- Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
- Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. Complete count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Sample count items were asked only of a sample of farm operators. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Variability, measured as percent relative standard error, in the estimates of complete count items is due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. Variability in the estimates of sample count items is due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Thus, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard error for estimated number of farms in a county reporting a complete count item and the bottom half a sample count item. These are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used for complete count items and sample count items. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State. For sample count items, only data

from counties sampled at a rate of 1 in 6 are used in the estimation of the regression equation.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting: 25	5.4 3.2 1.9 .5 .4 .4 .3 .2 .2 .2 (X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting: 25 50 75	19.5 15.9 14.5
100 150 200	13.8 13.0 12.6
300 500 750 1,000	12.2 11.8 11.6 11.5
1,500 2,000	(X) (X)

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1987 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count item estimates comes only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures; thus, the estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of \$10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general

purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies will be conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used

by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS will be protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list

coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of

completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.
- Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met.

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text			Relative standard error of estimate	Item		Relative standard error of estimate	
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		Total	(percent)	FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES ¹		Total	(percent)
_		0.740					
FarmsLand in farms	acres	8 716 32 876 071	.6 .1	Total farm production expenses		8 715	.6 .5
Average size of farm	acres	3 772	.6	Average per farm	\$1,000 dollars	675 225 77 479	.5 .8
				Liverted, and modern much and		4 000	0.0
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL				Livestock and poultry purchased	\$1,000	4 060 212 437	2.3 .8
PRODUCTS SOLD				Feed for livestock and poultry	\$1,000	6 227 89 381	1.4 .8
				Commercially mixed formula feeds	farms \$1,000	2 213 15 051	3.4 2.4
Total sales (see text)	\$1,000	8 716 824 205	.6 .1		V 1,000		
Average per farm	dollars	94 562	.6	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees	\$1.000	2 635 8 772	2.6 1.8
Farms by value of sales:				Commercial fertilizer	farms \$1.000	2 922 21 444	2.6 1.8
Less than \$1,000 (see text)	\$1.000	930 193	1.3 2.3	Agricultural chemicals	farms \$1.000	3 249 9 491	2.4
\$1,000 to \$2,499	\$1,000	601 1 010	1.7 1.7	Petroleum products	farms	8 034	2.3 .9
\$2,500 to \$4,999	farms \$1.000	722 2 641	1.6 1.6		\$1,000	36 536	.9
\$5,000 to \$9,999	farms \$1.000	946	1.3	Electricity		6 457	1.4
\$10,000 to \$19,999	farms	6 834 1 009	1.4 1.3	Hired farm labor	\$1,000 farms	10 979 3 416	1.3 2.2
\$20,000 to \$24,999	\$1,000 farms	14 607 376	1.3 1.7	Contract labor	\$1,000 farms	57 677 1 924	.5 3.2 2.3 1.2
	\$1,000	8 367	1.7	Repair and maintenance	\$1,000	8 831 7 274	2.3
\$25,000 to \$39,999		706	1.2 1.2	, ,	\$1,000	42 591	.9
\$40,000 to \$49,999	\$1,000 farms	22 554 386	1.3	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment	farms	2 390	3.0
\$50,000 to \$99,999	\$1,000	17 169 1 185	1.3 .7 .7	Interest expense		9 393 4 727	2.2 1.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999	\$1,000	85 233 1 203	.7 -	Secured by real estate	\$1,000 farms	53 470 3 228	1.9 1.2 2.6 1.7
\$250,000 to \$499,999	\$1.000	188 115 436	_	Not secured by real estate	\$1,000	32 750 2 941	1.7 2.6
	\$1.000	150 889	_	,	\$1,000	20 720	1.4
\$500,000 or more	farms \$1,000	216 326 593	_	Cash rent	farms	2 632	2.8
Sales by commodity or commodity group: Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	3 286	.7	Property taxes	\$1,000 farms	24 436 7 941	1.8 .9
Grains	\$1 000	153 862 1 740	.7 .3 .7	All other farm production expenses	\$1,000	15 428 8 248	1.3 .8 .9
Corn for grain	\$1 000	60 081 408	.3 1.0	All other family production expenses	\$1,000	74 359	.9
Wheat	\$1.000	9 795 657	.7 .8				
	\$1.000	15 631	.4	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL			
Soybeans	\$1.000	_	_	SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) 1			
Sorghum for grain	\$1.000	4 13	_				
Barley	farms \$1,000	703 23 398	.9 .5	All farms	_number	8 715	.6
Oats	farms \$1,000	279 1 257	1.5 1.2	Average per farm	\$1.000	140 895 16 167	1.8 1.9
Other grains	farms \$1,000	391 9 987	1.1			10 107	1.0
	\$1,000	9 967	.7	Farms with net gains ²	_number \$1,000	5 021 176 029	1.6 1.2
Cotton and cottonseed	farms \$1,000		_	Average net gain		35 059	2.0
Tobacco	farms \$1,000	_	_	Farms with net losses	_number	3 694	2.2
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms \$1,000	2 227 35 448	.8 .5	Average net loss	\$1,000 dollars	35 134 9 511	3.1 3.8
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	\$1,000	26 394	6.0 1.2				
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms \$1,000	12 8	9.1 14.3	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME			
Niverse and arrest to the control of							
Nursery and greenhouse crops	\$1 000	55 2 637	4.2 3.0	0		4 707	
Other crops	farms \$1,000	513 55 294	.8 .2	Government payments	\$1,000	1 787 18 052	.6 .4
Livestock, poultry, and their products	forme	6 908	.6	Other farm-related income 1	\$1,000	2 264 15 302	3.5 4.5
	\$1,000	670 343	.1	Customwork and other agricultural services	farms \$1,000	648 5 306	.4 3.5 4.5 7.0 7.3 5.7
Poultry and poultry products	\$1,000	157 268	2.6 9.9	Gross cash rent or share payments		1 063 6 767	5.7 7.7
Dairy products	\$1,000	123 11 168	1.9	Forest products and Christmas trees		58 642	8.2 1.5
Cattle and calves	\$1,000	5 866 583 570	.5 .1	Other farm-related income sources		949 2 587	5.0 8.0
Hogs and pigs	farms \$1,000	342 5 415	1.7		φ1,000	2 301	6.0
Sheep, lambs, and wool		1 526 60 207	.9 .8 .1				
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)		1 214		COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION			
(G XI)	\$1,000	9 714	.9 1.2	LOANS			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to							
	farms	351	1.7	Total	.	136	1.5 1.2

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 -Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introd	ductory text]					
ltem		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE				TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland	farms	6 756	.6	All operators farms		.6
Harvested cropland	acres	2 842 020 5 735	.3	acres. Full owners farms.	4 051	.1 .8 .1
Farms by acres harvested:	acres	1 532 732	.2	acres. Part owners farms.	3 436	.1 .5
1 to 9 acres		298	2.2 2.4	acres. Tenants farms.	22 204 960 1 229	.5 (L) .9
10 to 19 acres		1 487 328	2.0	acres.		.2
20 to 29 acres	acres farms	4 393 297	2.1 2.1	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
30 to 49 acres	acres farms	6 696 512	2.1 1.6	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
	acres	19 048	1.6	Land owned farms.		.6 .1
50 to 99 acres		900	1.2 1.2		7 487	.6
100 to 199 acres		62 506 1 126	1.0			.1
200 to 499 acres	acres farms	152 375 1 421	1.0 .5	Land rented or leased from othersfarmsacres.	13 579 339	.5 . <u>1</u>
500 to 999 acres	acres farms	436 666 594	.5 .3	landlords. Rented or leased land in farmsfarms .	4 665	.5 .5
1,000 acres or more	acres	404 737 259	.3	acres		.1
1,000 acres of more	acres	444 824	-	Land rented or leased to othersfarms acres.		1.0 .9
Cropland:						
Pasture or grazing only	acres	3 280 721 162	.8 .7	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Other cropland	farms acres	1 646 588 126	.7 .5	Operators by place of residence:		
T				On farm operated	6 500 1 665	.6 .9
Total woodland	acres	751 785 001	.8 .2	Not on farm operated	551	1.2
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	5 453	.5	Operators by principal occupation:	5 040	_
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc	acres	28 946 215 4 069	(L) .7	FarmingOther	5 612 3 104	.5 1.0
Irrigated land	acres	302 835 5 076	.3	Operators by days worked off farm:		
ingated land	acres	1 464 585	.3	Any	4 251 2 435	.8 1.0
Acres irrigated:				Operators by sex:		
1 to 9 acres	acres	324 1 587	2.1 2.3	Male farms.	_ 30 774 140	.6 .1
10 to 49 acres	acres	1 070 27 506	1.3 1.4	Female farms.		1.2 .2
50 to 99 acres	farms acres	784 54 462	1.3 1.3	Average age of operatoryears		.8
100 to 199 acres	acres	957 131 107	1.1 1.1	Average age of operatoryears	55.4	.0
200 to 499 acres	farms	1 185 365 205	.7	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
500 to 999 acres		487	.6 .4		0.704	
1,000 acres or more		335 055 269	.4 .1	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)farms acres.	_ 14 543 592	.6 .1
	acres	549 663	.1	Partnership farms acres.		.9 .1
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms acres	4 499 1 099 037	.6 .3	Corporation: Family held farms.	788	.6
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	2 132	.8	acres. More than 10 stockholdersfarms	8 507 932	(L)
	acres	365 548	.4	10 or less stockholdersfarms	759	.6
Land under federal acreage reduction programs: Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms	536	.8	Other than family heldfarms .	52	2.3
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve	acres	10 947	.5	More than 10 stockholdersfarms .	8	(L)
Programs	farms	469	1.0	10 or lose stockholders forms	44	2.7
	acres	192 445	.9	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etcfarms acres.		2.1 (L)
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS 1					4 224 000	(=)
				HIRED FARM LABOR		
Estimated market value of land and buildings	\$1,000	8 715 5 241 521	.6 1.0	Hired workers by days worked:		
Average per farmAverage per acre		601 437 159	1.2 1.1		1 130	2.6 1.3
g- p				Less than 150 days	2 864 8 623	1.3 2.5 2.4
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	1			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of all machinery and				Form related initiation		
equipment	\$1.000	8 691 468 114	.6 1.2	Farm-related injuries: Operator and family membersfarms .		1.6
Average per farm	dollars	53 862	1.3		10/	1.7 .7
				number.		.5
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹				Farm-related deaths:	_	
Operation of the stillings	4-			Operator and family membersfarms number.	1 3	
Commercial fertilizeracres on	which used	2 923 692 246	2.6 1.7	Hired workers farms number.		(D)
San footpatos at and of table						

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory te	\(\(\mathref{i}\)				
ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres	449 1 468 994 27 226 257 14 868 335 27 360	1.8 2.3 1.5 1.5 2.3 2.3 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1	Cattle and calves inventory farms	5 839 1 424 002 5 114 746 789 523 7 596 5 866 1 014 982 583 570 379 39 128	.6 .2 .6 .2 1.1 .7 .5 .1 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 8.9
acres	38 651	2.1	number\$1,000 Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	60 335 5 415 1 462	
140 to 179 acres farms 180 to 219 acres farms acres acres	426 67 140 289 57 648	1.9 1.9 2.0 2.0	Sheep and lambs sold farms Number Horses and ponies inventory farms	921 133 1 505 915 604 4 516	.8 .2 .8 .2 .6
220 to 259 acres farms 260 to 499 acres farms 500 to 999 acres farms acres_ farms acres_ farms	217 51 754 1 007 372 361 1 079 757 941	2.3 2.3 1.1 1.1 1.0 1.0	Horses and ponies soldnumber farms number POULTRY	40 671 1 026 5 190	.6 1.0 1.3
1,000 to 1,999 acresfarms	880 1 236 778 2 445 30 222 876	1.0 1.0 - -	Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms number Hens and pullets of laying agefarms number Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms number	516 26 315 511 24 984 8 382	1.4 7.3 1.4 7.7 12.9 9.9
			CROPS HARVESTED		
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			Corn for grain or seed	488 54 341 5 332 116 390 29 077 482 859 670	.9 .6 .6 .9 .4 .4
Cash grains (011) farms acres acres Field crops, except cash grains (013) farms acres acres Vegetables and melons (016) farms acres farms Horticultural specialties (018) farms acres acres acres acres	575 703 629 1 109 2 283 957 5 (D) 5 (D) 50 3 740	1.2 .5 1.1 .2 18.1 (D) 14.9 (D) 4.4 8.5	acres_bushels_Darley for grain bushels_Earms acres_bushels_Darley for grain bushels_Darley for grain acres_bushels_Darley edible beans, excluding dry limas acres_	211 312 5 264 505 857 104 167 8 178 366 620 31 757 1 723 289 346 29 709	.9 6.6 9.9 4.4 .4 .5 .4 .4 .1.0 .8 .8 .8 .1.1
General farms, primarily crop (019) farms acres. Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) farms acres. Dairy farms (024) farms acres. Poultry and eggs (025) farms	310 219 750 5 734 27 082 108 91 63 272 28	1.6 .8 .6 .1 2.1 1.4 6.2	Irish potatoes CWt Irish potatoes carces_ acres_ cwt Sugar beets for sugar farms _ acres_ tons_ Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass	517 834 19 2 059 574 219 497 72 550 1 451 023	.8 .8 4.4 .1 .1 .9 .3
Animal specialties (027) acres farms_ acres General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) farms_ acres acres	7 252 645 478 613 164 2 033 314	4.6 1.5 .6 2.1	silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms acres tons, dry Alfalfa hayfarms acres tons, dry	5 032 1 017 562 1 756 092 3 730 484 510 1 123 866	.6 .3 .3 .6 .4 .4

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.
²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS				FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES ¹		
FarmsLand in farms		5 517 29 658 662	.5 .1 .5	Total farm production expensesfarms	655 878	.7 .5
Average size of farm		5 376	.5	Average per farmdollars		.8
				Livestock and poultry purchasedfarms	210 243	2.3 .8
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD				Feed for livestock and poultryfarms\$1,000 Commercially mixed formula feedsfarms\$1,000	87 038 1 718	1.3 .8 3.6 2.4
Total sales (see text)		5 517	.5	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and treesfarms\$1,000 Commercial fertilizerfarms	8 567	2.5 1.8
Average per farm	\$1,000 dollars	813 527 147 458	.1 .5	\$1,000_ Agricultural chemicals	21 027	2.5 1.8 2.4
Farms by value of sales:				\$1,000	9 243	2.4 2.3 8
\$10,000 to \$19,999	farms \$1,000	1 009 14 607	1.3 1.3	\$1,000 Electricity		.8 .9 1.4
\$20,000 to \$24,999	farms \$1,000	376 8 367	1.7 1.7	\$1,000	10 241	1.3
\$25,000 to \$39,999	farms \$1,000	706 22 554	1.2 1.2	Hired farm laborfarms	2 909	2.0
\$40,000 to \$49,999	farms \$1,000	386 17 169	1.3 1.3	\$1,000 Contract laborfarms	1 571	.5 3.0
		17 103	1.5	\$1,000_ Repair and maintenancefarms	5 128	2.3 1.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999	\$1,000	1 185 85 233	.7 .7	\$1,000 Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery		.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999	\$1.000	1 203 188 115		and equipmentfarms \$1,000	. 9 076	2.9 2.2
\$250,000 to \$499,999	\$1,000	436 150 889	_	Interest expensefarms	51 057	1.9 1.2
\$500,000 or more	farms \$1,000	216 326 593		Secured by real estatefarms	30 787	2.6 1.7
Sales by commodity or commodity group: Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	2 409	.6	Not secured by real estatefarms	2 536 20 270	2.6 1.4
Grains	\$1,000	151 082 1 530	.6 .3 .6 .3	Cach rent farms	2 169	2.8
Corn for grain	\$1,000 farms	59 292 393	.3 1.0	Cash rent	23 538 5 093	1.7 1.0
Wheat	\$1,000	9 741 566	1.0 .7 .7	\$1,000	13 684	1.4 .7 .9
Soybeans	\$1,000 farms \$1,000	15 250 - -	.5 - -	\$1,000_	71 957	.9
Corebura for avair	forms	4		NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL		
Sorghum for grainBarley	\$1.000	13	_	SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) 1		
Oats	\$1.000	637 23 196	.8 .5			
	\$1,000	234 1 176	1.5 1.2	All farmsnumber		.7
Other grains	\$1,000	372 9 916	1.0 .7	\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	149 517 26 935	1.6 1.8
Cotton and cottonseed	farms	_	_	Farms with net gains ² number	4 115	1.5
Tobacco	\$1,000 farms		_ _	\$1,000 Average net gaindollars	174 080 42 304	1.2 1.9
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms	1 534	_ .8	Farms with net lossesnumber	1 436	3.9
	\$1,000	33 604	.5	\$1,000	24 564	3.9 5.5
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms \$1,000	15 (D)	6.4 (D)	Average net loss	17 100	5.5
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms \$1,000	(D)	16.4 (D)	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Nursery and greenhouse crops		34	5.0	PARM-REATED INCOME		
Other crops		2 541 506	3.1 .8 .2	Government payments farms	1 453	E
	\$1,000	55 268	.2	Other farm-related income ¹	16 386	.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products	farms \$1,000	4 866 662 445	.5 .1	Customwork and other agricultural servicesfarms	12 917	.5 .3 3.8 4.9 7.3 7.7 7.1
Poultry and poultry products		67 225	3.1 11.6	\$1,000	4 935	7.3 7.7
Dairy products	farms \$1,000	111 11 135	1.8	Gross cash rent or share paymentsarms	5 033	7.1 9.0 .7
Cattle and calves	farms \$1,000	4 526 578 109	.7 .5 .1	\$1,000	579	.7 .3 5.1
Hogs and pigs	farms \$1,000	196 5 194	1.8	Other farm-related income sourcesfarms		5.1 8.4
Sheep, lambs, and wool	farms \$1,000	999 59 012	.9 .7 .1			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)		743 8 770	.9 1.3	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)		194 578	1.7 1.8	Totalfarms\$1,000		1.5 1.2

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992—Con.

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Total cropland farms	4 581	.5	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)farms _	3 983	.6
acres Harvested cropland farms	2 544 590 4 219	.5 .3 .5 .2	Partnershipfarms_	_ 13 547 271 720	1. 8.
acres	1 457 195	.2	acres_		.1
Cropland: Pasture or grazing only farms	1 972	.7	Corporation: Family held farms_	_ 701	.5 (L)
acres_	574 077	.6	acres_ More than 10 stockholdersfarms _	8 404 240 29	(L)
Total woodland farms	526	.7	10 or less stockholdersfarms _	672	.5
acres Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and	741 007	.2	Other than family heldfarms _	_ 37	2.3
woodland pastured farms	3 873	.4	acres_ More than 10 stockholdersfarms _		(L)
acres Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etcfarms	26 097 209 2 566	(L) .6	10 or less stockholdersfarms _	30	2.8
acres Irrigated land farms	275 856 3 521	.3 .6 .3 .6 .2	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etcfarms _	_ 76	2.4
acres	1 380 527	.3	acres_	2 344 710	(L
Harvested cropland irrigatedfarms acres	3 319 1 052 519	.6 .2	HIRED FARM LABOR		
Pasture and other land irrigatedfarms	1 332	.8	Hired workers by days worked:	4 000	
acres	328 008	.4	150 days or morefarms _ workers_	4 278	2.4 1.2
Land under federal acreage reduction programs: Diverted under annual commodity programsfarms	502	.7	Less than 150 daysfarmsworkers_		2.4 2.5
acres	10 699	.5		- 7 808	2.0
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms	346	.9	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
acres	156 461	.9 .7	Farm-related injuries: Operator and family members farms _	_ 142	1.5
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS 1			number_ Hired workers farms_	_ 165	1.4
	5 551	7	number_		.6 .4
Estimated market value of land and buildingsfarms \$1,000	4 516 455	.7 1.0	Farm-related deaths:		
Average per farmdollars Average per acredollars	813 629 152	1.2 1.1	Operator and family members farms _	- 3 (D)	- (5
			number_ Hired workersfarms_ number_	_ ` ź	(D (D
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT 1 Estimated market value of all machinery and			FARMS BY SIZE	- (5)	(D
equipment farms	5 545	.7	1 to 9 acres	_ 140	2.7
\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	416 650 75 140	1.2 1.4	10 to 49 acres 50 to 69 acres		3.3 4.3
, notago por tarri			70 to 99 acres	_ 101	3.5 3.2
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹			100 to 139 acres		3.2 2.5
Commercial fertilizer farms	2 323	2.5	180 to 219 acres	_ 152	2.6
acres on which used	668 637	1.7	220 to 259 acres		2.7 1.3
TENURE OF OPERATOR			500 to 999 acres		1.0 1.0
All operators farms	5 517	.5	2,000 acres or more		-
acres Full owners farms	29 658 662	.1	FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL		
acres	1 941 6 386 545	.8 .1	CLASSIFICATION		
Part ownersfarmsacres	2 770 20 038 839	.4 (L)	Cash grains (011)	424	1.2
Tenants farms	806	.9	Field crops, except cash grains (013) Vegetables and melons (016) Fruits and tree nuts (017) Horticultural specialties (018)	600	1.1
acres	3 233 278	.1	Fruits and tree nuts (017)	:	-
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			Horticultural specialties (018) General farms, primarily crop (019)	_ 33 _ 164	5.1 1.6
Land owned farms	4 732	.5	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties	1	
Owned land in farmsfarms	18 535 864 4 711	.1 .5	(021) Dairy farms (024)	_ 82	1.9
acres_	17 840 258	.1	Poultry and eggs (025)	- 4	12.1
Land rented or leased from othersfarms	3 605	.4	General farms primarily livestock and animal		3.2
acres landlords	12 085 118 7 752	.1 .4	specialties (029)	- 9	6.9
Rented or leased land in farmsfarms	3 576	.4	LIVESTOCK		
acres	11 818 404	.1	Cattle and calves inventoryfarms _	4 394	
Land rented or leased to othersfarmsacres	962 320	1.0 .8	number_	_ 1 388 440	.2
40165	332 323	.0	Beef cows farms _ number_	. 727 205	
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			Milk cows farmsnumber_	_ 402	1.1 .7
Operators by place of residence:			Cattle and calves soldfarms _		.5
On farm operatedNot on farm operated	4 264 934	.5 1.0	number_	_ 1 002 116	.1
Not reported	319	1.0	\$1,000_ Hogs and pigs inventoryfarms _	578 109 204	1. 1.8
Operators by principal occupation:			number_ Hogs and pigs soldfarms _	_ 36 297	1.8
FarmingOther	4 469 1 048	.5 1.1	number_	_ 57 506	3.
	1 048	1.1	\$1,000_		.9.
Operators by days worked off farm: Any	2 058	.8	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventoryfarms _ number_		
200 days or more	907	1.1	Sheep and lambs soldfarms _	_ 991	
Operators by sex:			number_	1	.2
Male	5 130 387	.5 1.2	Horses and ponies inventoryfarms _ number_	2 806 28 546).
			Horses and ponies soldfarms _	_ 643	2.
Average age of operatoryears	53.8	.7	number_	4 223	1.4

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992 - Con.

ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarmsnumber	283 20 296	1.5 9.4	Barley for grain farms acres bushels	779 102 344 8 095 491	.8 .4 .4
Hens and pullets of laying agefarms number	282 19 948	1.5 9.6	Oats for grain farms acres bushels	544 29 914 1 635 292	.9 .8 .7
Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms number	1 (D)	(D)	Dry edible beans, excluding dry limasfarmsacres cwt Irish potatoesfarms	336 29 485 514 756 15	1.1 .8 .8 2.6
CROPS HARVESTED			acres cwt	2 057 573 719	.1
Corn for grain or seedfarmsacres	467 53 940	.9 .6	Sugar beets for sugar farms acrestons	492 72 517 1 450 408	.8 .3 .3
bushels Corn for silage or green chopfarms acres	5 304 357 382 28 885 479 874	.6 .8 .4	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms acres	3 693 953 902	.5
Wheat for grain tons, green farms acres bushels	573 203 230 5 108 451	.4 .7 .5 .4	tons, dry	1 673 899 2 808 448 439 1 070 394	.5 .2 .3 .6 .3

¹Data are based on a sample of farms. ²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992

	All fa	irms	Farms with sales of	of \$10,000 or more
ltem	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farmsnumber	-5.3	.8	.8	.7
Land in farmsacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacres	-2.1 3.3	.1 .9	4.5 3.7	.1 .8
Average per farmdollarsdollarsdollars	12.8 8.2	1.9 1.8	13.7 8.6	1.9 1.7
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment 1: Average per farmdollarsdollars	17.8	2.3	13.5	2.2
Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres	-43.5	1.4	-39.9	2.0
10 to 49 acres	.5 	2.1 1.7	21.7 18.7	5.4 2.9
180 to 499 acres	-1.5 -1.1	1.5 1.4	2.5 6.6	1.8 1.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres	−7.8 −1.6	1.3	−5.1 .2	1.4
Total croplandfarms	-6.6	.8	-1.9	.7
Harvested croplandfarms	.1 –10.2	.8 .5 .7	2.6 -5.6	.7 .5 .7
acres	-10.7	.4	-9.4	.4
Irrigated landfarms acres	-2.8 -3.5	.9 .5	2.2 -1.4	.9 .4
Market value of agricultural products sold\$1,000	21.8 28.6	.3 1.1	22.3 21.3	.2 .9
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops\$1,000 Livestock, poultry, and their products\$1,000	23.4 21.4	.6 .2	24.3 21.8	.6 .2
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500	-22.9	.9	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	-5.7 -3.2	2.0 1.8	ixi (x)	(X) (X) (X) 1.4 1.3 1.1
\$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999	-7.5 -12.0	1.4 1.3	-7.5 -12.0	1.4
\$50,000 to \$99,999	2.7	1.1	2.7	1.1 (L)
\$100,000 to \$249,999 \$250,000 to \$499,999 \$500,000 or more	13.1 30.1 17.4	(L) 	13.1 30.1 17.4	(L) - -
Total farm production expenses ¹ \$1,000 Average per farm dollars	25.7 32.8	1.0 1.5	27.3 25.7	1.1 1.4
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) 1farms	-5.3	.8	1.3	.9
\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	3.3 9.1	2.4 2.8	1.6 .3	.9 2.2 2.3
Operators by principal occupation: Farming	-5.7 -4.6	.7 1.3	-1.5 11.5	.7 1.7
Operators by days worked off farm:	0.4	4.0	_	0.5
Any	-9.1 -7.8	4.6 4.7	4 9.7	3.5 5.6
Livestock and poultry: Cattle and calves inventory	-2.5	.8	1.2	.7
number Beef cowsfarms	.8 .6	.8 .3 .8 .3	2.3 4.4	.7 .2 .7 .3
	8.4 -33.6	.3 1.0	9.4 -29.8	.3 1.0
number	-18.2	1.0	-17.0	1.0
Cattle and calves soldfarms number	-1.7 6.1	.8 .2 1.7	1.5 6.5	.7 .2 1.7
Hogs and pigs inventoryfarms number	-20.0 37.6	3.0	-26.6 40.8	1.7 3.1 2.0
Hogs and pigs soldfarms number	-16.0 11.2	1.9 2.4	-19.0 12.9	2.0 2.6
Sheep and lambs inventoryfarmsnumber	-6.8 .4	1.1	-8.8 .2	2.6 2.6 .9 .2 1.0
Chickens 3 months old or older inventorytarmsnumber	-44.5 -10.0	1.0 6.8	-43.6 12.8	1.0 10.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms number	-78.4 -96.0	3.0 1.1	-94.7 (D)	.3 (D)
Selected crops harvested: Corn for silage or green chop acres	-9.9 -2.8	1.1	-9.9 -2.7	1.1 .7
tons, green Wheat for grainfarms	-2.6 -5.0 -27.5	.7 .6 .8	-2.7 -4.9 -27.9	.6
writeat for grainacres bushels	-27.3 -16.4 -27.0	.6 .5	-27.9 -16.3 -26.9	.6 .7 .6 .5 .8 .7
Barley for grainfarmsacres	-28.0 -18.2	.8 .7	-26.9 -17.6	.8
bushels_ Dry edible beans, excluding dry limasfarms	-5.5 -12.2	., .7 1.4	-17.0 -4.9 -12.0	., .7 1.4
acres cwt	-12.2 -12.3 -16.3	1.0 1.0	-12.5 -16.4	1.0
Sugar beets for sugarfarmsacres	24.3 27.4	1.7 .7	24.9 27.6	1.7 .7
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop,	23.3	.6	23.4	.6
etc. (see text)farmsacres tons, dry	-11.4 -10.2 -7.8	.7 .4 .4	-6.8 -8.3 -6.0	.7 .4 .4
ions, dry	-1.0	.4	-0.0	.4

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992

[For meaning of appreviation	ations and symbols, see introductory text]												
	Fai	rms	Lar	d in farms	3	Average siz	ze of farm	Average m and bui	arket value o Idings per far	f land m ¹	Estimated mar machinery an	ket value of all d equipment 1	
Geographic area	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Ti (aci	otal es)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Va (dolla	s ilue e	Relative tandard error of estimate percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wyoming Albany	8 716 294 516 476 287	. 6 .6 .8 .6 .5	32 876 (1 868 ; 441 ; 2 704 ; 2 720 ;	333 321 63	.1 .1 .5 .1	3 772 6 355 855 5 681 9 480	. 6 .6 .9 .6 .5	601 4 948 3 274 2 449 4 1 281 2	369 233 402	1.2 3.8 3.3 4.1 2.6	468 114 14 136 28 140 21 430 19 136	1.2 4.1 2.5 5.2 3.0	
Converse	305 442 877 675 138	.5 .5 .8 .6	2 363 2 1 542 2 2 415 4 1 234 8 908 3	162 173 142	.1 .2 .1 .2 .1	7 748 3 489 2 755 1 829 6 582	.5 .5 .8 .6	809 (515 4 465 (393 9 956 4	438 092 901	2.0 6.8 2.7 2.9 3.6	16 423 22 770 42 950 43 282 6 798	5.4 5.9 4.5 3.0 4.1	
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	290 564 511 292 278	.4 .5 .7 .6 .3	2 055 8 1 700 8 558 9 2 508 1 1 344 8	356 366 349	.1 .2 .3 .1 .1	7 088 3 015 1 094 8 592 4 837	.4 .5 .7 .6 .3	731 2 540 5 508 8 950 4 481 3	112 355 449	5.1 2.4 9.3 6.0 3.4	14 198 35 137 23 544 11 608 13 363	3.9 6.3 9.4 5.8 5.4	
Park	579 462 533 238 154	.5 .4 .7 .5 1.0	797 : 1 364 ! 1 208 : 592 : 1 720 :	748 776 754	.2 .2 .3 .2 .1	1 377 2 954 2 268 2 491 11 174	.6 .4 .8 .5 1.0	442 5 537 5 564 9 949 6	502 115 179	2.9 3.4 5.5 3.3 2.1	37 597 29 625 22 980 13 015 7 627	3.3 6.1 2.8 5.1 9.6	
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	102 265 207 231	.8 .9 .4 .3	62 3 879 6 397 8 1 484 8	94 83	.9 .2 .2 .1	611 3 320 1 922 6 427	1.2 .9 .4 .3	1 025 7 596 7 476 2 682 8	731 276	3.5 6.5 3.7 7.2	5 314 10 243 18 200 10 597	7.6 5.0 1.9 6.8	
	Average mark machinery and far	equipment per	Market va	ue of agrid		Average mar agricultural pro far	ducts sold per		Farm	production	expenses 1		
									Total fa	arm product	duction expenses		
Geographic area									Farms		Va	lue	
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	T((\$1,0	otal 00)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Num	s	Relative tandard error of estimate percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	53 862 48 081 54 641 45 020 66 676	1.3 4.2 2.8 5.3 3.2	824 : 33 : 39 : 31 : 46 :)46)45)77	.1 .3 .4 .2	94 562 112 401 77 413 67 178 160 850	.6 .6 .9 .7	2	715 294 515 476 287	.6 .9 1.3 .7 1.0	675 225 26 101 31 073 28 265 40 188	. 5 1.9 3.0 2.9 .9	
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	54 743 51 515 48 918 64 504 49 263	5.6 6.0 4.6 3.1 4.3	24 8 28 7 56 0 127 10 2	66 92 60	.2 .3 .4 .1	81 471 64 403 63 959 188 385 74 384	.6 .6 .9 .6	8	305 442 378 375 138	.8 .7 .9 .8 1.4	19 551 21 461 43 066 111 534 7 321	1.1 1.9 2.2 .9 1.7	
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	48 959 62 410 46 074 40 588 48 069	3.9 6.4 9.4 6.1 5.5	23 2 61 3 25 24 21 8	888 78 21	.3 .2 .5 .3	80 061 108 843 49 271 82 606 78 437	.5 .5 .9 .7 .4		290 564 511 292 278	.7 .7 .8 .8	19 057 52 035 18 480 18 488 17 312	4.5 1.6 3.3 1.3 3.8	
Park	65 844 64 123 43 196 54 685 49 528	3.6 6.1 2.9 5.1 9.8	57 (62 9 32 9 25 9 7 (05 13 33	.2 .2 .5 .3 1.0	98 447 136 159 61 000 108 962 49 414	.6 .4 .9 .5 1.4		579 462 532 238 154	.7 .7 .9 .9	45 538 53 759 27 727 20 733 6 137	1.3 1.3 3.6 2.1 1.9	
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	51 596 38 653 88 348 45 875	7.8 5.2 2.1 6.8	8 9 16 9 32 9 26	75 88	.5 .5 .2 .2	87 315 62 546 159 362 112 990	1.0 1.0 .4 .4		103 265 206 231	1.8 1.3 .8 .8	7 730 13 089 25 193 21 384	.9 4.8 1.1 2.8	
						Farm production	expenses 1—Cor						
	Live	stock and poultry	purchased Value			Feed for livesto	ck and poultry Value			eds, bulbs,	plants, and tree	Value	
Geographic area	ı aillis	Relative	value	Relative		Relative	value	Relative	ı a	Relati	ve	Relative	
	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	standard error of estimate (percent)	Numb	standard error of estimate	Total (\$1,000)	standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	standa error estima (percer	of ite Tot		
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	4 060 170 214 243 182	2.3 10.7 11.7 7.3 7.9	212 437 11 021 3 390 7 844 14 489	.8 2.9 5.0 8.6 .6	3 4	27 1.4 45 5.9 11 7.4 18 3.8 33 5.5	89 381 2 418 1 994 5 066 4 391	.8 2.5 11.5 2.5 3.6	2 635 18 272 84 57	1 8 15	i.9 1 10 i.3 17	1.9 7 5.6	
Converse	178 220 419 293 58	6.5 9.9 7.2 8.6 5.9	2 899 4 865 10 812 56 426 1 081	4.1 3.7 2.7 .6 5.8	3 5 4	40 4.7 44 5.1 90 4.9 65 4.0 01 3.9	2 894 3 454 4 994 17 054 893	2.9 7.2 2.3 1.0 1.7	70 135 272 407 36	14 8 5	1.5 10 1.0 11 1.7 68 1.7 2 09 1.5 6	4 10.9 8 12.8	

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[1 Of Theathing of abbreviation	one and symbo	10, 500 1111 000	otory toxtj		Fa	ırm production	expenses 1—C	on.				
	Liv	vestock and po	oultry purchased	ı l		eed for livestoo			Se	eds, bulbs, pla	ints, and trees	
Coorronhio	Fari	ms	Val	ue	Fai	ms	Val	ue	Far	ms	Va	llue
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	160 237 240 94 165	11.6 9.4 9.9 6.7 8.5	3 526 19 577 3 465 2 310 5 743	16.4 3.3 15.1 .2 8.7	234 322 326 210 237	6.6 6.5 5.4 6.0 4.9	2 239 7 091 2 655 3 143 2 810	4.3 3.0 5.3 1.2 6.0	46 200 178 44 46	16.4 8.2 10.4 17.8 19.2	57 831 180 101 78	2.3 3.3 9.2 4.7 16.7
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	227 170 233 108 74	10.8 12.5 10.0 10.6 11.3	8 380 21 980 6 102 5 397 925	1.9 1.7 10.1 4.4 5.8	339 318 425 194 110	6.9 7.2 4.6 6.3 7.0	4 553 6 613 4 062 3 273 1 634	4.3 2.4 7.0 7.7 1.9	242 160 146 41 38	7.8 11.8 14.6 22.6 15.8	1 319 710 225 53 49	3.4 7.4 3.4 8.8 17.1
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	36 151 85 103	11.4 13.6 18.4 13.6	2 376 3 655 7 246 8 927	.7 15.1 .7 3.4	58 223 122 162	7.9 4.3 12.4 7.8	874 1 348 2 298 3 630	4.0 12.3 2.9 2.1	17 14 91 21	14.3 - 12.7 -	12 12 676 36	10.6 - .6 -
					Fa	rm production	expenses 1—C	on.				
			ial fertilizer			Agricultural				Petroleum		
Geographic area	Fan Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Fai Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Val Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Far Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	2 922 76 304 17 136	2.6 13.7 8.9 – 9.5	21 444 536 3 457 91 1 065	1.8 3.0 6.8 - 2.4	3 249 46 296 189 58	2.4 16.6 8.1 8.8 9.3	9 491 130 1 253 242 101	2.3 2.4 7.5 8.5 1.3	8 034 265 458 434 275	.9 4.9 4.2 3.2 1.0	36 536 1 148 2 556 1 858 1 851	.9 3.0 3.8 5.4 1.8
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	52 57 465 368 26	15.0 23.1 6.4 5.7 8.7	199 127 2 118 3 465 85	3.0 13.7 8.7 5.3 9.2	94 145 303 358 46	8.6 9.5 9.7 6.6 9.1	138 335 669 1 554 31	1.2 8.2 5.3 8.7 4.2	285 398 823 640 125	3.6 3.5 2.1 1.9 2.3	1 416 1 587 2 708 3 733 533	2.9 3.3 3.9 2.5 1.6
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	81 168 144 49 7	19.1 10.7 14.7 14.7	190 1 351 314 197 53	9.1 5.2 5.7 6.0	59 177 220 87 70	14.7 8.8 11.2 14.1 15.4	114 656 179 111 237	12.4 6.7 4.5 9.1 30.9	272 499 486 275 270	3.2 3.2 2.3 2.5 2.2	1 430 2 364 1 541 1 212 1 089	3.6 3.4 7.4 3.1 4.5
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	333 164 96 59 46	6.7 11.4 16.6 18.6 12.6	3 744 1 157 334 323 169	3.1 4.8 6.6 10.0 6.8	343 204 235 40 25	6.5 10.6 10.3 21.3 19.0	1 507 693 273 53 42	3.7 8.1 16.0 47.8 11.5	536 399 497 220 147	2.8 4.5 3.0 3.9 2.6	2 855 2 096 1 620 1 150 498	1.9 6.5 6.6 2.5 3.1
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	28 123 111 12	14.8 15.7 11.9	215 563 1 631 63	12.2 7.4 .7 –	27 59 129 39	11.1 30.4 8.8 20.2	56 54 999 64	5.1 6.3 .7 19.0	90 231 191 218	3.1 5.9 4.5 3.1	337 766 1 343 846	3.4 4.8 1.3 3.8
					Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.							
-	Fari		tricity Val	ue	Fai	Hired far	m labor Val	ue	Far	Contrac		ılue
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	6 457 195 393 395 209	1.4 7.2 6.2 4.3 6.1	10 979 326 421 552 551	1.3 7.2 3.4 4.0 2.3	3 416 104 222 137 129	2.2 10.0 11.1 7.9 5.3	57 677 2 285 3 158 1 780 4 758	. 5 .8 3.0 .5 1.2	1 924 56 176 79 93	3.2 13.7 13.3 10.7 13.5	8 831 301 1 129 245 300	2.3 4.2 6.0 2.7 10.7
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	235 363 623 546 116	5.4 5.2 4.4 3.8 3.5	368 408 832 1 324 172	2.2 7.6 10.4 2.5 3.7	113 151 288 354 44	10.0 9.8 7.4 7.4 5.2	2 590 1 528 3 864 5 203 1 151	2.4 2.2 2.0 2.2 1.7	75 99 198 131 21	9.8 14.9 11.6 3.7 9.0	376 223 808 923 87	5.5 7.5 9.3 2.2 1.5
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	235 431 310 173 219	4.6 4.9 8.5 8.3 4.6	316 1 310 505 330 369	5.7 4.1 8.1 4.6 7.9	129 211 206 109 93	8.5 10.7 7.7 10.1 10.7	2 030 4 226 1 680 2 869 787	5.4 .8 1.0 1.3 2.4	93 96 57 67 70	11.8 15.4 21.1 15.0 15.8	516 469 163 318 160	12.5 11.4 2.2 1.9 12.7
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	408 378 350 174 91	6.0 4.1 6.5 7.6 8.0	579 1 043 413 289 103	3.4 3.7 7.3 5.9 13.2	261 172 180 117 48	7.2 11.0 11.9 5.7 9.0	5 537 2 964 2 826 2 500 398	1.6 5.2 1.5 2.2 .6	153 90 113 46 24	12.4 14.5 17.1 14.6 18.2	859 354 390 236 63	6.7 13.5 30.2 2.4 4.9
See footnotes at e	end of table.											

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

For meaning of abbreviation	ons and symbo	ns, see introdu	ctory text]		Fa	rm production	expenses 1—Co	on.				
		Elec	tricity			Hired far		0	Contract labor			
	Far		Val	ue	Far	ms	Val	ue	Fai	rms	Value Relativ	
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	73 179 173 188	6.0 10.2 6.2 5.7	131 143 276 222	3.9 6.6 3.2 5.7	38 115 112 83	9.6 15.1 13.5 16.7	769 903 2 595 1 276	1.5 1.2 2.4 4.5	17 68 75 27	19.9 21.7 14.4 -	49 244 494 121	12.2 7.6 3.4
						<u> </u>	expenses 1—Co					
		Repair and maintenance Customwork, machine and						machinery	Interest expense			
Geographic area	Far	ms	Value		Farms		Val	ue	Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	7 274 215 413 426 246	1.2 7.0 5.2 3.6 5.1	42 591 1 821 2 648 1 853 2 095	.9 2.6 4.3 8.2 1.9	2 390 36 186 86 60	3.0 16.9 13.5 12.5 11.4	9 393 109 937 332 336	2.2 2.9 8.7 3.2 15.0	4 727 140 307 263 156	1.9 10.2 8.7 6.8 8.0	53 470 2 212 2 760 2 352 3 033	1.2 3.8 4.9 5.3 3.9
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	245 385 741 605 117	6.1 3.8 3.2 2.9 3.6	1 630 1 631 2 970 4 443 631	2.3 4.2 3.7 2.4 1.8	61 99 289 314 33	19.0 12.5 9.1 7.5 8.6	153 321 920 1 480 80	16.6 13.3 5.5 6.2 5.2	186 214 440 495 74	7.2 10.3 6.3 4.2 6.2	1 954 2 441 3 805 5 057 960	4.3 3.1 4.9 4.0 2.1
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	263 452 410 231 246	4.7 3.5 6.1 5.5 4.4	1 394 2 796 1 601 1 318 1 100	4.7 2.4 6.6 2.6 4.1	59 192 127 59 55	9.7 8.2 17.4 16.8 18.6	215 1 363 177 285 188	10.1 6.4 17.3 17.3 11.7	197 303 232 165 160	6.3 8.1 10.5 8.8 7.6	2 004 3 678 2 080 1 969 1 452	8.1 3.9 8.2 4.9 6.3
Park	479 392 410 203 128	4.2 4.5 5.8 6.0 4.9	3 842 2 611 1 848 1 370 398	2.6 4.5 5.6 2.7 6.2	222 87 140 45 27	10.5 13.7 16.4 – 18.4	742 352 413 194 57	4.2 8.8 18.9 - 7.6	249 287 272 102 85	8.3 7.9 10.0 10.6 8.7	3 096 4 660 2 909 1 775 576	4.9 6.1 8.6 3.0 4.9
Teton	76 220 166 205	5.8 5.1 8.1 4.7	1 030 932 1 727 902	1.3 2.4 1.5 5.5	17 61 82 53	9.5 23.8 14.1 23.6	94 81 422 143	3.9 3.0 1.6 4.8	33 119 127 121	11.5 16.4 10.8 12.9	394 1 026 1 671 1 605	2.1 3.4 8.5 4.3
					Fa	-	expenses 1—Co	on.				
	Far	Cash	Value		Farms		axes paid Val	110	All Fai	other farm prod	•	es ————————————————————————————————————
Geographic area .	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	2 632 94 126 186 108	2.8 16.3 12.9 8.5 12.4	24 436 648 1 507 1 481 1 263	1.8 4.5 4.6 5.0 6.4	7 941 254 483 419 271	.9 5.5 2.2 3.4 3.2	15 428 626 1 021 575 774	1.3 4.5 6.1 3.8 1.6	8 248 269 494 453 275	.8 4.7 2.4 2.0 3.2	74 359 2 470 3 736 3 823 5 138	.9 3.5 8.3 2.6 1.9
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	99 216 192 209 34	9.3 8.7 12.8 9.7 7.0	1 076 1 198 983 1 821 314	6.3 6.2 11.6 8.4 4.8	275 396 816 631 132	3.6 4.2 2.2 1.7 1.6	519 547 1 305 1 459 204	3.6 3.7 4.5 4.4 1.8	284 398 839 651 132	2.7 2.9 1.8 1.7 2.2	3 240 2 681 5 593 5 494 1 036	1.2 3.0 2.7 4.1 2.7
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	96 170 142 67 118	13.5 12.4 16.2 16.1 10.5	1 362 1 797 458 729 860	3.6 8.1 13.5 12.1 7.0	267 491 468 257 228	3.6 3.4 2.8 4.6 4.4	843 805 544 692 384	5.4 3.0 3.3 11.5 5.3	288 529 486 272 265	.8 2.3 2.5 2.8 2.5	2 820 3 722 2 938 2 903 2 002	3.9 2.7 9.9 1.4 4.7
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	172 138 142 52 27	10.6 14.0 12.9 17.5 19.3	2 168 1 422 1 522 520 167	4.1 11.8 13.1 8.0 4.2	533 409 496 237 138	2.6 4.2 2.3 .9 4.7	1 056 868 815 665 178	3.8 7.8 10.3 2.9 4.7	540 452 508 222 153	2.5 1.7 2.4 3.9 1.7	5 303 6 237 3 976 2 935 881	2.8 2.4 2.7 1.9 4.8
Teton	21 66 69 88	17.5 18.3 19.8 13.6	282 896 853 1 108	1.0 1.8 2.6 8.0	89 255 190 206	3.6 2.8 4.5 4.8	372 337 505 334	4.5 5.0 9.2 4.4	93 233 192 220	3.1 3.8 4.4 3.0	739 2 128 2 458 2 106	1.6 2.1 2.3 5.0

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[r or mouning or approvide	1	n from agricult	ural sales for th	e farm unit								-	
	Net casif fetul	(see t	ext) ¹	ie iaiiii uiiit		Total c	ropland			Harvested	cropland		
Geographic area	Farr	ns	Valu	ue	Far	ms	Acre	es	Farr	ms	Ac	res	
Coograpmo area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wyoming	8 715 294 515 476 287	.6 .9 1.3 .7 1.0	140 895 6 321 8 041 4 347 6 232	1.8 5.6 9.2 11.9 8.3	6 756 180 457 268 215	. 6 1.3 .9 1.2 1.0	2 842 020 112 639 128 270 162 007 171 309	.3 1.1 .9 .7	5 735 150 398 194 197	.6 1.4 1.1 1.3 1.1	1 532 732 81 541 82 824 56 296 106 081	.2 .6 .6 .6	
Converse Crook Crook Goshen Hot Springs	305 442 878 675 138	.8 .7 .9 .8 1.4	4 738 7 083 11 274 15 519 2 493	3.7 4.8 6.1 5.2 7.1	203 350 764 568 110	1.1 .8 .9 .7 1.1	76 511 160 515 (D) 295 958 30 596	1.5 .7 (D) .7 1.2	169 297 653 500 96	1.3 .9 1.0 .8 1.5	40 951 71 175 103 417 142 187 19 638	1.0 .5 .7 .5	
Johnson	290 564 511 292 278	.7 .7 .8 .8 .7	3 039 7 940 6 293 5 039 5 922	26.0 5.7 6.9 4.0 12.3	166 436 456 186 170	1.1 .8 .8 1.4 1.0	56 816 (D) 128 791 55 744 73 916	1.3 (D) .6 1.4 1.1	137 348 403 161 131	1.2 .9 .9 1.6 1.2	31 797 157 137 87 670 26 506 28 322	.5 .6 1.1 1.0	
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	579 462 532 238 154	.7 .7 .9 .9 1.7	12 273 8 997 5 076 4 053 1 106	6.0 7.4 9.2 3.6 18.9	510 360 441 192 114	.7 .7 1.0 1.0 1.8	125 896 187 850 115 521 147 141 (D)	.8 .7 1.3 .5 (D)	453 271 390 177 98	.8 1.0 1.1 1.0 2.1	98 236 78 974 63 316 98 032 21 993	.5 .4 .8 .4 1.9	
Teton	103 265 206 231	1.8 1.3 .8 .8	1 130 2 367 7 233 4 379	10.0 30.4 4.5 9.3	81 230 174 125	1.8 1.2 .9 1.3	25 732 92 856 52 855 48 359	1.5 1.0 .4 1.4	59 206 153 94	2.7 1.3 1.0 1.5	13 710 53 540 44 409 24 980	1.8 .7 .4 .7	
	'	Irrigate	ed land					Livestock a	nd poultry				
	Farr	ns	Acres		Cattle and cal		alves inventory		Beef cows		s inventory		
Geographic area					Farms		To	Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	5 076 162 462 5 198	. 6 1.4 .9 8.4 1.1	1 464 585 131 183 108 309 2 260 161 498	.3 .5 .7 .4 .3	5 839 193 322 370 213	. 6 1.2 1.2 .9 1.0	1 424 002 61 681 46 682 77 234 107 779	. 2 .4 .8 .3 .2	5 114 178 291 333 195	. 6 1.3 1.3 .9 1.1	746 789 31 560 23 854 43 365 61 640	. 2 .6 .8 .3 .2	
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	146 29 762 435 106	1.4 3.1 .9 .9 1.3	37 408 5 535 132 197 104 521 26 956	.5 .8 .6 .8	227 347 539 443 95	1.0 .8 1.1 .9 1.5	68 869 67 531 102 840 116 543 31 754	.2 .4 .7 .3 .4	209 316 470 370 84	1.0 .9 1.2 1.0 1.6	38 954 39 627 55 396 39 893 19 008	.3 .5 .8 .5 .5	
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	151 173 393 172 49	1.2 1.3 1.0 1.5 1.6	39 051 49 239 82 128 32 007 7 989	.9 .6 .6 .9 1.8	229 278 344 163 239	.8 1.2 1.1 1.5 .6	58 563 63 915 54 252 49 887 54 918	.4 .3 .5 .3	211 234 231 144 220	.9 1.3 1.3 1.6 .7	36 128 32 349 27 703 31 594 31 626	.4 .4 .5 .3	
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	511 241 307 196 104	.7 1.1 1.3 .9 1.9	113 476 60 380 45 514 133 675 28 520	.5 .4 1.0 .4 1.6	273 347 406 184 96	1.3 .8 1.0 1.0 2.1	67 456 87 830 75 177 69 418 23 771	.5 .3 .6 .4 1.3	240 303 355 169 91	1.3 .9 1.1 1.0 2.2	29 491 36 208 43 599 38 283 (D)	.6 .4 .7 .4 (D)	
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	77 221 166 10	2.1 1.3 .9 -	23 848 88 177 46 908 3 806	1.0 .9 .4 -	43 205 110 173	3.3 1.4 1.5 .9	9 151 48 340 30 008 50 403	1.6 .7 .6	35 183 99 153	3.8 1.5 1.6 1.0	(D) 26 193 15 450 24 695	(D) 1.0 .7 .3	
		Maile	inventor				poultry —Con.						
	Farr	Milk cows		al	Far	Hogs and pig	Tota	al		Sheep and lam		tal	
Geographic area		Relative	Total Relative			Relative		Relative	Farms Relative			Relative	
	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	523 14 28 29 18	1.1 7.1 5.5 4.4 4.7	7 596 23 213 61 51	.7 6.4 4.0 5.0 6.0	379 12 25 24 14	1.7 7.2 5.9 6.4 9.1	39 128 462 4 335 335 157	1.0 4.8 5.3 7.4 27.5	1 462 46 116 113 49	.8 3.8 2.4 2.1 3.3	921 133 14 073 50 798 68 029 43 703	1.5 .9 .4	
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	22 31 31 22 7	2.6 3.5 4.7 5.8 5.2	60 92 701 176 9	2.2 2.4 .5 2.2 4.1	11 19 40 20 8	10.3 5.2 4.9 6.0 10.4	309 1 504 1 330 3 243 (D)	20.6 4.9 6.5 1.1 (D)	75 87 173 41 22	2.1 2.0 2.2 4.7 5.2	106 661 41 287 51 063 2 692 8 035	.2 .6 1.2 6.1 2.6	

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviation	ons and symbo	JIS, SEE II III OC	luctory text]											
	Livestock and poultry —Con.													
		Milk cov	s inventory			Hogs and pigs inventory					Sheep and lambs inventory			
Geographic area	Fa	rms	To	otal		Farn	ns	То	otal	Fa	arms		Tota	al
	Number	Relative standare error o estimate (percent	d f e	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	d f e	nber	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relativ standa error estima (percer	rd of te	Relative standare error of estimate (percent	d f e	umber	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	20 20 70 11 22	5.: 7.: 2.: 5.: 3.:	7 279 1 3 371 3 176	3.8 4.4 1.0 5.7 6.5	1 0 7	13 38 22 20 3	6.7 4.1 7.0 7.4 14.0	137 20 226 869 630 (D)	14	.6 53 .2 56	3. 3. 3.	7 6 6 3 4 10	7 946 4 297 0 933 3 184 5 546	.2 .2 .5 .3
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	31 41 29 25 15	4.5 3.3 5.0 4.7 5.0	761 354 7 52	1.8 2.0 4.0 6.1 (D	0 0 1	23 22 18 5 7	5.5 6.3 6.5 14.5 13.5	687 2 744 115 11 74	6		4. 3. 5.	4 2 1 6 1	7 899 (D) 5 879 7 497 7 282	.6 (D) 2.4 .4 .9
Teton	8 16 6 7	8.7 7. 9.5 5.7	182	(D .9.1 8.0	9 1	- 17 9 9	7.6 10.2 8.1	166 439 1 048	24 19 12	.9 74 .1 55	2.	7 4 8 4	(D) 3 260 1 600 5 684	(D) .9 .7 1.1
							Livestock and	poultry —Con						
		Her	s and pullets of	aying age inv	rentory				Broil	ers and other me	eat-type chicke	ns sold		
Geographic area		Farms		Tota	I			Farms			To	otal		
3. sp. 11. sp. 12. sp.	N	lumber	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	1	Number	Relative standard error o estimate (percent	d f e	Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell		511 19 29 46	1.4 6.4 5.9 4.2		24 984 484 660 1 327		7.7 7.2 8.2 5.8		8 1 - -	12.9	-	382 (D)		9.9 (D)
Carbon		10	8.8		309		6.5		1	43.8		(D)		(D)
Converse Crook Street Crook Goshen Coshen Hot Springs Converse Con		37 31 38 20 8	4.4 4.3 5.3 5.6 7.8	876 687 700 961 170			5.7 4.3 6.7 2.8 7.6	2 - - - -		28.0	6 (D) 		(D) (D)	
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara		14 27 27 12 16	6.1 5.7 5.8 8.3 5.4	358 581 1 454 (D) 216			5.1 10.4 13.9 (D) 7.9	2 1 - -		24.5 40.5		(D) (D) - -		(D) (D)
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater		45 33 33 14 12	4.3 4.6 5.4 4.5 8.8		13 116 700 657 326 336		14.5 4.5 6.0 3.9 13.8		- - - -		- - -	- - - -		- - - -
Teton Uinta Washakie Weston		4 14 6 16	12.4 8.5 10.9 6.2		(D) 218 157 518		(D) - 13.5 - 15.3 - 4.4 1		-	34.3	 	_ _ (D)		_ _ (D)
							Selected cro	ps harvested						
			Corn for silage	rn for silage or green chop Wheat for grain										
Geographic area	Farr	ns	Acres		C	Quantity		Farr	Farms		es	Quantity		ty
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, gr	reen	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	E	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell	390 60 1	.9 - 2.0 - -	29 077 - 3 744 (D) (D)	.4 - 1.1 (D) (D)	482 68	859 - 415 (D) (D)	.4 1.0 (D) (D)	670 1 25 51 3	.8 - 4.5 1.8 12.7	18 970	.5 (D) 2.1 .3 5.0	1	64 505 (D) 02 062 64 359 44 898	.4 (D) 1.4 .5 4.1
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	13 3 60 118 5	- 2.6 1.6 7.3	1 394 126 4 317 6 165 126	- 1.5 1.1 4.1	70 106	890 700 084 378 175	- 1.7 .9 3.4	7 70 7 128 –	6.1 2.2 5.6 1.6	2 034 10 625 462 40 850	17.4 .8 2.4 1.1	3	48 848 51 625 27 878 96 056	14.9 1.0 2.1 1.0
Johnson Laramie Lincoln Natrona Niobrara	3 17 2 6 1	11.5 1.8 16.8 –	192 2 062 (D) 659 (D)	7.7 .4 (D) - (D)	33	050 119 (D) 269 (D)	7.9 .4 (D) – (D)	3 225 9 1 21	1.2 8.1 - 3.6	397 (D)	(D) .6 8.8 (D) 4.0		(D) 47 307 11 252 (D) 79 891	(D) .6 12.1 (D) 7.2
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	27 47 7 -	2.0 2.5 - -	1 972 5 793 410 –	1.2 .8 - -	87	601 521 871 –	.7 .7 - - -	22 42 34 - 1	3.6 2.9 4.4 50.0	1 502 20 564 3 986 (D)	1.9 1.2 3.4 (D)	4	98 608 13 497 42 287 (D)	2.0 .9 3.1 _ (D)

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

Corn for silage or green chop

Number

Relative standard error of

estimate

(percent)

Selected crops harvested

Number

Relative standard error of estimate

(percent)

Tons, green

Wheat for grain

Number

Relative standard error of estimate

(percent)

Relative standard error of

estimate (percent) Quantity

Bushels

Relative standard error of estimate

(percent)

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Number

Relative standard error of estimate

(percent)

Geographic area

Teton Uinta Washakie Weston	1 - 17 1	2.4 -	(D) - 1 564 (D)	(D) - .8 (D)	(D) 31 600 (D)	(D) - .5 (D)	_ 1 2 17	- - 3.6	(D) (D) 1 261	(D) (D) 2.5	(D) (D) 38 252	(D) (D) 2.3
					Se	elected crops	harvested -C	on.				
		Barley for grain Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas										
Geographic area	Far	ms	Acre	es	Quantit	y	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
3.3g.ap.m3	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wyoming Albany Big Horn Campbell Carbon	857 2 145 29 1	.8 - 1.6 3.1 -	104 167 (D) 21 369 2 119 (D)	.4 (D) .9 1.7 (D)	8 178 366 (D) 1 802 742 68 408 (D)	.4 (D) .9 1.1 (D)	346 - 63 - -	1.1 - 2.7 - -	29 709 6 591 –	.8 - 1.6 - -	517 834 121 002 -	.8 _ 1.3 _
Converse Crook Fremont Goshen Hot Springs	8 41 111 7 10	2.8 2.0 5.6 7.2	1 126 2 374 10 332 264 738	2.2 1.6 1.9 3.9	45 220 80 300 837 405 18 576 60 433	2.3 1.5 1.7 4.7	- 18 118 1	- 6.1 1.8	1 318 7 658 (D)	5.7 1.1 (D)	24 103 137 638 (D)	5.6 1.2 (D)
Johnson	2 11 180 9 6	2.7 1.5 10.1 5.2	(D) 870 14 590 480 446	(D) .4 1.4 5.6 1.9	(D) 66 668 778 469 24 640 15 612	(D) .3 1.4 4.9 2.0	- 22 - - -	3.0 - - -	2 459 - - -	3.1 - - -	44 456 - - -	2.2 - - -
Park Platte Sheridan Sublette Sweetwater	173 5 41 - 3	1.3 7.0 3.3 – 22.0	29 358 421 2 146 - 175	.8 3.8 2.4 - 6.7	2 785 006 26 440 133 483 (D)	.8 2.0 2.4 – (D)	90 19 - - -	2.0 4.5 - -	8 713 1 666 - - -	1.8 2.3 - - -	144 677 (D) - - -	1.7 (D) - -
Teton Uinta Washakie	5 5 63	9.9 8.6 1.7	2 027 245 14 864	1.3 8.7 .4	149 500 9 720 1 252 936	1.4 6.6 .1	- - 15 -	- 3.2	_ (D)	_ (D)	- - 25 751	- 1.1 _
Weston		_	_		_					_		
Weston		_	_		Se	elected crops	harvested -C	on.		_		
Weston			Sugar be	ets for sugar	Se	elected crops			small grain, wil	d, grass silag	e, green chop, etc.	(see text)
	Fai	rms	Sugar be		Se Quantit			a, other tame,	small grain, wil		e, green chop, etc. Quanti	
Geographic area	Fai	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)					Hay —alfalfa	a, other tame,	1			
Geographic area .		Relative standard error of estimate	Acre	Relative standard error of estimate	Quantii	Relative standard error of estimate	Hay —alfalfa Far Number 5 032	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number 1 017 562	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Quanti Tons, dry 1 756 092	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Acre	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Quantit	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hay —alfalfa Far Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Acr	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Quanti Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Geographic area Wyoming Albany Big Hom Campbell	Number 497 _ 108	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number 72 550 16 023	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons 1 451 023 347 218	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number 5 032 146 323 170	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .6 1.4 1.2 1.5	Number 1 017 562 81 013 28 563 32 148	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .3 .6 1.0 .9	Tons, dry 1 756 092 76 300 83 239 25 656	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .3 .8 .9 1.0
Wyoming Albany	Number 497 108 1 - 26 182	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 9 1.6 - 3.0	Number 72 550 16 023 (D) 4 306 18 585	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .367 (D)	Quantiti Tons 1 451 023 347 218 (D) 88 561 311 097	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .3 (D) 1.2 .8	Number 5 032 146 323 170 193 163 278 625 342	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .6 1.4 1.2 1.5 1.1 1.0 1.0 1.1	Number 1 017 562 81 013 28 563 32 148 105 103 36 455 56 916 79 523 36 252	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3 6 1.0 9 4 6 55 9 7	Quanti Tons, dry 1 756 092 76 300 83 239 25 656 141 492 67 877 47 996 222 971 111 091	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .3 .8 .9 1.0 .6 .3 .5 .8 .7
Wyoming	Number 497	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 9	Number 72 550 16 023 (D) 4 306 18 585 (D) (D) (D)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3	Quantiti Tons 1 451 023 347 218 (D) 88 561 311 097 (D) (D)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .3 . (D)	Far Number 5 032 146 323 170 193 278 625 342 92 133 206 378 146	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .6 1.4 1.2 1.5 1.1 1.3 1.0 1.0 1.1 1.6 1.2 1.3 1.0 1.7	Acri Number 1 017 562 81 013 28 563 32 148 105 103 36 455 56 916 79 523 36 252 18 085 31 082 40 400 73 465 22 312	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3 6 6 1.0 9 4 6 5.5 9 7.7 1.2 4 8 8 5 5 1.2	Tons, dry 1 756 092 76 300 83 239 25 656 141 492 67 877 47 996 222 971 111 091 38 608 70 385 69 745 122 410 52 745	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3 8 9 1.0 6 8 7 1.9 4 8 6 6 1.4
Wyoming	Number 497 108 1 266 182 1 7 93 26 93	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 9	Number 72 550 16 023 (D) 4 306 18 585 (D) (D) 17 451 3 913	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3	Quantiti Tons 1 451 023 347 218 (D) 88 561 311 097 (D) (D) 401 745	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3 - 5 - (D) - 1.2 .8 (D) - (D) - (D)	Number 5 032 146 323 170 193 278 625 342 92 133 206 378 146 122 375 229 369 176	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) .6 1.4 1.2 1.5 1.1 1.3 1.00 1.0 1.1 1.6 1.2 1.3 1.00 1.7 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1	Acri Number 1 017 562 81 013 28 563 32 148 105 103 36 455 56 916 79 523 36 252 18 085 31 082 40 400 73 465 22 312 20 802 36 877 40 790 56 069 98 311	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3 6 6 6 1.0 99 .4 6 5 5.9 9 .7 1.2 .4 8 5.5 1.2 9 9 5.5 9 9 .4 4	Quanti Tons, dry 1 756 092 76 300 83 239 25 656 141 492 67 877 47 996 222 971 111 091 38 608 70 385 69 745 122 410 52 745 26 327	Relative standard error of estimate (percent) 3.3

Table G. State Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error: 1992

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

	Census publ	ished farms	Not on m	nail list 1	Percent not	on mail list 1
Item	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farmsnumber_ Land in farmsacres Average size of farmacres	8 716 32 876 071 3 771.9	.6 .1 .6	876 193 955 221.3	33.5 36.3 35.7	9.1 .6 (X)	3.2 .2 (X)
Farms by size: Less than 10 acres 10 to 49 acres Less than 50 acres 50 acres or more 50 to 99 acres 100 to 179 acres 180 acres or more	449 994 1 443 7 273 592 764 5 917	1.8 1.5 1.3 .5 1.7 1.5	108 391 500 377 58 88 230	69.0 60.2 50.1 45.9 (H)) 74.5 62.0	19.4 28.2 25.7 4.9 8.9 10.4 3.7	10.8 12.7 10.0 2.3 8.5 6.9 2.4
Harvested cropland farms acres	5 735 1 532 732	.6 .2	415 34 420	42.9 45.4	6.8 2.2	2.9 1.0
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$1,000 \$1,000 to \$2,499 Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 or more \$2,500 to \$9,999 \$10,000 or more	930 601 1 531 7 185 1 668 5 517	1.3 1.7 1.2 .6 1.2	555 18 573 303 119 184	39.4 75.2 38.7 41.4 78.7 46.4	37.4 3.0 27.2 4.0 6.7 3.2	9.2 2.2 7.7 1.6 4.9 1.4
Market value of agricultural products sold\$1,000	824 205	.1	13 375	46.7	1.6	.7
Farms by standard industrial classification: Crops (01) Livestock (02)	2 054 6 662	.8 .6	207 669	60.0 33.9	9.2 9.1	5.0 3.3
Farms by type of organization: Individual or family	6 781 1 816 119	.6 .6 2.1	864 (L) —	33.9 (H) (X)	11.3 (L)	3.8 (L) (X)
Farms by tenure of operator: Full owners Part owners and tenants Part owners Tenants	4 051 4 665 3 436 1 229	.8 .5 .5 .9	692 172 6 166	34.2 59.5 91.5 61.6	14.6 3.6 .2 11.9	5.0 2.1 .2 6.5
Operators by place of residence: On farm operated Not on farm operated Not reported	6 500 1 665 551	.6 .9 1.2	628 19 229	35.1 61.8 52.1	8.8 1.1 29.4	3.3 .7 10.8
Operators by principal occupation: FarmingOther	5 612 3 104	.5 1.0	139 422	55.4 39.4	2.4 12.0	1.3 4.6
Operators by sex: Male Female	7 922 794	.6 1.2	743 133	36.6 74.0	8.6 14.4	3.2 9.0
Operators by race: White Black and other races	8 603 113	.6 2.8	562 -	33.6 (X)	6.1	2.1 (X)
Operators by years on present farm: 4 years or less 5 years or more Average years on present farm	1 174 6 352 19.1	1.2 .6 .8	140 292 14.2	56.6 52.3 57.2	10.7 4.4 (X)	5.6 2.4 (X)
Not reported	1 190	.9	444	39.4	27.2	8.6
Average age of operator	53.4	.8	46.7	33.7	(X)	(X)

Note: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

¹Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.